

REMARKS

In the Office Communication dated August 1, 2006, the Examiner asserted that the May 10, 2006 Response filed by the Applicants was not fully responsive as allegedly failing to address a double-patenting rejection in the outstanding Office Action.

However, the outstanding Office Action dated February 10, 2006 does not contain any double-patenting rejection. In fact, the Examiner in the February 10, 2006 Office Action acknowledged the receipt of a terminal disclaimer filed by the Applicants to overcome a double-patenting rejection raised in a previous Office Action dated August 24, 2005.

During a telephonic conversation between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney, the Examiner conceded that the August 1, 2006 Office Communication was issued in error.

Therefore, Applicants hereby request the Examiner to accept the May 10, 2006 Response as being fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and to consider the May 10, 2006 Response on its merits.

If any issues remain outstanding, incident to the formal allowance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (516) 742-4343 to discuss same, in order that this application may be allowed and passed to issue at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Yongzhi Yang
Registration No. 56,310

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
MY